

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 10:01:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #194
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 17 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 194

Today's Topics:

 Blind VEs (4 msgs)
 Field day rules question (ARRL) (2 msgs)
 NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action
 NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 00:03:29 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vnp4v\$e03@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster
of Peladon) writes:

>

>And when we win the quality of testing
>won't suffer. But I'm sure that we'll hear sour-grapes grumblings from the
>sighted equivelant of white supremacists for a good deal of time to come.

There goes the accusations of racism again. Of course, you'll deny that
you wrote this, or that it refers to racism.

You aren't paranoid, David. Everyone really *is* out to get you.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 16 Jun 1993 22:39:45 -0500
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!
doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dana Myers, KK6JQ writes in article 1647:

>>
>>And when we win the quality of testing
>>won't suffer. But I'm sure that we'll hear sour-grapes grumblings from the
>>sighted equivalent of white supremacists for a good deal of time to come.
>
>There goes the accusations of racism again. Of course, you'll deny that
>you wrote this, or that it refers to racism.
>

Quite the contrary, Dana. Far from denying that I wrote this, I take a great deal of pride in knowing that I wrote it. In fact it is quite possible that this and other articles in this newsgroup will be seen in periodicals with international circulation (not that it isn't already being seen on the net internationally). And when and if this is done, both sides will have their *complete* articles published. With the exception of the usual editing that magazines do, these periodicals will not simply publish whatever parts of articles support their politics, as you've done here, Dana.

But I will correct you on one point. This is not an accusation of racism. If it were, I would have written, "Gary is a racist." But I didn't write that, as readers can see from the above article, and from my *original* article, which you didn't quote in its entirety.

If it is not an indication that I feel that racism is being practiced however, it *is* an indication that I feel that bigotry is present. No, I am *not* saying that everyone who disagrees with me is a bigot. They are simply people who hold a different viewpoint. But no other conclusion (for me personally) can be drawn from Gary, KE4ZV's writings. This is not the view of the National Federation of the Blind or anyone else except myself.

As I've said before, when I see a clear sign of bigotry I intend to say that this is what I see. Believe me, as one who has *lived* (and not just read

about) the civil rights movement, I can recognize prejudice and closed-mindedness when I encounter it.

>You aren't paranoid, David. Everyone really **is** out to get you.

I will treat this last sentence for what it is, merely a personal insult, which it is beneath my dignity to validate with a response.

>--

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
* |

73 to All!

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will **NEVER** go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: 17 Jun 93 07:24:35 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vnp4v\$e03@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>

>Gary, KE4ZV writes in article 1633:

>

>>

>>No matter how many times, or for how long, you repeat this claim, it's
>>still just a claim and not a fact. The information bandwidth of any
>>human information channel other than the visual is insufficient to
>>convey the uninterpreted visual information of the observer to a third
>>party. Thus you are depending on the interpretation and judgement of
>>the observer for the proctoring. You are not the proctoring agent.
>>Someone, it may have been you, mentioned "seeing eye" dogs as an
>>example. Again, it's the dog that's doing the observing, and it's
>>the dog that's making the decisions. Would you follow just any
>>stray dog across the street? Or would you demand a trained and
>>certified guide dog? I submit that most people would want the
>>certified guide dog, and so apparently does the FCC.

>>

>

>And once again we hear from a sighted expert on blindness. Gary, you don't
>choose to recognize *fact* when it's staring you in the face. And you've been
>the one playing word games with your harping on dictionary definitions ever
>since you got into this debate. And no matter *what* sort of snide reply you
>make to this post, I don't think that I'll answer it, because it would take
>nuclear explosives to change your mind. The blind know what our capabilities
>are. We've been proving ourselves for decades as I've said. That proof has
>been challenged in the courts and the blind have won. I think that it's the
>concept of the blind acting for themselves that you have the real problem with
>here, not any argument over "observing." You will of course deny this, since
>you seem to be *very* interested in saying that which is politically expedient.
>But your writings prove otherwise.

Well I see you resort to personal attacks and pathetic attempts at
character assassination rather than addressing the issues again.
Just answer the question, would you follow the stray, or would
you demand a certified guide dog?

>>In the past, the FCC has demanded that the *operators* of stations
>>as well as their employers be licensed. This under the theory that
>>the operator is the one in immediate control of the situation,
>>not the employer. Under pressure from the industry, the FCC has
>>backed off from this requirement, and technical quality has suffered
>>as a result. This is a parallel to allowing unlicensed proctors for
>>the amateur exams. Your organization may be able to pressure the
>>FCC into rescinding this requirement too, but playing word games
>>doesn't lessen the fact that it's the observer who's doing the
>>observing, not his employer.

>>

>

>This paragraph actually made me smile, Gary. You give the same tired old
>argument that other minorities have heard when they were preparing to break
>down an unfair barrier. Why didn't you just say, "It'll bring down my property
>values if we let *them* move into the neighborhood." Or perhaps, "*They* can't
>lift heavy weights like men so the Department will suffer decreased performance
>averages with them on the job" would have been more appropriate here.

What I'm saying above is that those who are in immediate control are
required to be licensed, not just their employers. If you can resist
the temptations to character assassination for just a bit, perhaps
you can address the substantive issues instead of drifting off into
political diatribes.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary

to respond that this proves your point that blind people shouldn't proctor exams because if readers are like dog guides, you've made your point about the incapability of blind people.

Well sorry, but as Leonard Nimoy said in STAR TREK II: THE WRATH OF KHAN, "You proceed from a false assumption." Actually you proceed from a couple. First, the dog guide does **not** do the thinking in travel situations. If it did, the traveller and dog would be road pizzas in very short order. A dog guide is trained to obey the cues given it by the handler. If those cues conflict with the fact that a car is coming, the dog disobeys. This is something that the dog is trained to do at the school. While dog guides are among the best trained animals on Earth, let's not forget that they're animals, after all. Because they don't obey if told to walk in front of an oncoming vehicle (and some do, since some dog guides are trained better than others and each dog is different), this does **not** mean that they're exercising pseudo-human thought. It's just good training.

Second, you assume that all dog guides are certified by schools, which isn't the case. Some people use dog guides that are trained by private trainers. This is an example of one of the things we've been saying all along, which is that the orthodox method isn't always the best way to get things done.

Third, you assume that dog guides and readers are the same thing, which they aren't. I don't believe that I was the one who wrote that the two are the same. The fact is, Gary, that you've made your point about readers time and again, and time and again, we've responded to it with factual evidence that the reader system works fine for such situations as Proctoring exams. You persist in denying this however, and you base your entire argument on it. I'm not speaking for anyone but myself when I say that I get the strong impression that you are deeply offended by the fact that someone else might know more than you do on **any** subject. Show a little character, Gary. It's not a disgrace to lack knowledge in some area. Let yourself be taught a few things by others, and your knowledge will only **increase.**

>>

>>This paragraph actually made me smile, Gary. You give the same tired old
>>argument that other minorities have heard when they were preparing to break
>>down an unfair barrier. Why didn't you just say, "It'll bring down my property
>>values if we let **them** move into the neighborhood." Or perhaps, "**They** can't
>>lift heavy weights like men so the Department will suffer decreased performance
>>averages with them on the job" would have been more appropriate here.

>

>What I'm saying above is that those who are in immediate control are
>required to be licensed, not just their employers. If you can resist
>the temptations to character assassination for just a bit, perhaps
>you can address the substantive issues instead of drifting off into
>political diatribes.

Political diatribes...Hmmm...I imagine that when you yourself express a what you feel is a political opinion, it's just that---an opinion (I'll resist the temptation to say, "The Gospel from the Mount"). But when someone else espouses a concept that you don't agree with, it's a diatribe. Interesting (and predictable) logic.

Yes, I know what you were saying, Gary, and from that I drew the two analogies that I wrote. They were true, since your statement amounts to saying, "The world is going to Hell in a hand-basket 'cause of these derved minorities." And whether you liked it or not, that is in effect what you said about the blind, no matter how you try to improve your image by denying it. It's a bit late in the day for that, Gary. You've taken up the position that the blind are unfit, and you've used the language that you've used. It's meaning is clear.

And to once again address the subject of character assassination, I once again maintain that your past writings have proven what I say. I submit that if you have the courage of your own convictions you wouldn't care *what* I said. I indicated that some of your posts have been snide, and so they have. Apart from bringing forth the same old tired arguments, they've been little more than vehicles for venting your own acidic comments and backing a general philosophy about blindness that has seen better days. If you can't live with what you've written, then either admit that you were wrong (something which you'd *never* do) or don't write any more about it.

Gary, I am more than willing to discuss this thread with you on a basis of politeness. I am also willing to recognize that you have knowledge in areas that I don't, and to respect that. I'd do that for *anyone.* But if all you're willing to do is to trade personal attacks and insults, I quite frankly have better things to do with my time. I've said that I don't like flame wars and I meant it. I like to allocate my energies to more positive pursuits. So for me, this particular conflict ends here. It matters not at all to me, whether I loose some silly debate on the net. I and my fellow blind will win in Washington where it counts and in the meantime, I will cheerfully ignore any further posts of an insulting nature, and continue discussing this issue with those who are capable of disagreeing in a civilized manner.

>

>Gary

The opinions [or diatribes B-)] expressed above reflect my views alone, and do not represent the position of the National Federation of the Blind or anyone else, with the exception of myself. Have a good one everybody!

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will *NEVER* go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 05:13:01 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nshore!fmsystem!
andrews@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Field day rules question (ARRL)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I need a Field Day question answered ASAP,

section 8, part A, subpart 9, says:

VHF/UHF: 100 points can be earned by completing at least 10 QSO's
(excluding packet contacts) on any band or combination of bands
above 50 Mhz (VHF/UHF bands) during the Field Day period. A VHF/
UHF station (one) does not count as an additional transmitter.
This station is not limited to making just 10 QSO's. It may be
operated for the entire field day period and all contacts
(excluding packet contacts) count for QSO points credit, including
the first 10.

My club needs some clarification on this rule from the ARRL.

Please e-mail me a better explanation of this rule.

73 de N80FS

--

..
..

..

Date: 17 Jun 93 13:21:43 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!swrinde!gatech!pitt.edu!gvls1!rossi@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Field day rules question (ARRL)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C8r2Hq.4C1@fmsystem.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew
Sargent N80FS) writes:

Wrong! The root problem has nothing to do with building an antenna. In fact, it has nothing to do with amateur radio. It DOES have to do with the continued erosion of our rights to do what we want on our owned property. It has to stop somewhere.

Gary

Date: 16 Jun 93 22:52:40 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bobw@col.hp.com (Bob Witte) writes:

```
> raichel@HAN.Paramax.COM (Alan J. Raichel) writes:
>> re: Restrictive covenants - telling what you can and cannot do with your
>> property and the effect on amateur radio.
>>
> [stuff deleted ]
>
>> Some examples of some of the more absurd covenants some coworkers
>> say they have on their homes:
>>
>> - No cars parked in driveway - ALL cars MUST be in garage, and door closed.
>> - No lawn decorations - flag poles, lawn jockies, bird baths...
>> - No rust stains on driveways.
>> - No pickup trucks parked outside - must be in garage - if you have one.
>> - Limitations on what types of plants and trees that can be planted.
>
> Well. Cars parked in driveways could hurt my property values.
> Lawn jockies and bird baths, too. And, pickup trucks... enough said.
> And besides, no one really NEEDS these things, do they?
>
> :-) :-)
>
> Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY / (719) 590-3230
```

Actually for all those whiny neighbors.... let them build a 20 ft high wall around their house, then they won't have to see that car in your driveway, or your lawn ornaments, etc. Some of these covenants make neighborhoods plain and boring to say the least.

Kinda why I like living in the city, you don't have to sweat the bs.

"Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!
news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Paul Flaherty (paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu) wrote:
: In article <C8qD0z.3Dn@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) writes:
: >I thought this was a legal problem. Isn't that why we needed PRB-1 to
: >begin with, to fight anti-antenna laws?

What I was trying to say was that the problem is the increasing restrictions. It is good that we look for more efficient radiators but that doesn't mean we throw away our rights. If we use that argument then we should welcome restrictive antenna and power rules since the quality of communications is better today than it was 25 years ago. Look at the number of DXCC members there are now. If we had more restrictive antenna and power regs. then DXCC would mean something again. That argument doesn't work.

```
: You're comparing apples and oranges here.  Not to mention pandering alarmism.
: For starters, the long term trend has been towards an increase in spectrum for
: the amateur service.  Look at the table for 1970 and then 1990 and you'll see
: what I mean.
```

I am aware of the warc bands and I am not real sure about the higher freq.

stuff. How much was even allocated in the 70's? But I was comparing the possibility of spectrum loss. If lots of spectrum was being shifted from amateur allocation what would your response be? I don't remember hearing anyone saying the ARRL shouldn't bother lobbying the gov't regarding the 220 loss. They are apples and apples. WE have had the right to build antennas sufficient to complete our desired communications and we have had spectrum diverse and large enough to allow us to choose an appropriate frequency for our communications. An infringement on either aspect is similar. When tall antennas offer no advantage over short or ground level antennas then I'll fall in line with those who say lets not build towers.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

Date: 17 Jun 93 07:37:54 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.165632.27958@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <C8qD0z.3Dn@ucdavis.edu>,
<1993Jun16.221448.7234@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

In article <1993Jun16.221448.7234@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>

>You're comparing apples and oranges here. Not to mention pandering alarmism.
>For starters, the long term trend has been towards an increase in spectrum for
>the amateur service. Look at the table for 1970 and then 1990 and you'll see
>what I mean.

While gaining tiny slivers at HF, we've lost 2 MHz at 220 MHz, and 90%
of our satellite frequencies at SHF. We've gained 902-928 MHz, but that's
now being taken away again thanks to the political efforts of a vehicle
tracking company's legal wrangling. I don't think you can show net wins

in total spectrum between 1970 and today.

With the Clinton administration's intent to release 200 MHz of government spectrum to business users, and with most of our UHF/SHF spectrum shared with government, I'd say we're in grave danger of losing much more spectrum in the near future. The weather service's wind profiler radars are going to effectively clear 2 MHz of our 440 MHz band in many areas. Their impact "study" assumed amateur repeater antenna HAATs of 100 feet instead of the 800-1000 feet that's in actual use. They now intend to place the radars where they'll be useful, near metro airports, instead of way out in rural areas as they claimed. These things are going to be a disaster, and when they receive interference, guess who has to move.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 17 Jun 93 07:25:58 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.165632.27958@leland.Stanford.EDU> ,

<1993Jun16.191120.29322@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> ,

<1993Jun16.201054.3859@leland.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

In article <1993Jun16.201054.3859@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>

>VHF DX is another domain entirely. For some modes, you just can't get around
>the height requirement. For others (Sporadic E, Meteor, EME, Satellites),
>less so. At least the antennas are physically smaller for a given gain.

But unless the physical capture area is maintained the same, that gain is offset by increased path loss.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary

Lawrenceville, GA 30244

|

|

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #194
